Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/509,077	JOHNSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Emily Bernhardt	1624
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Emily Bernhardt</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Ms. Sieburth</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>13 February 2007</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		·
Prior art documents discussed:	,	
		•
Part II.	•	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	B DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview.
•		
\		
LBunhaudt		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The after final response of 2/9/07 overcomes all previous rejections. However a new specification is still needed. Ms. Sieburth informed the examiner that her assistant may have filed a supplemental response providing a substitute specification which corresponds to the PCT application. Upon inspection of eDAN the examiner noted that it had been filed. The examiner called later in the same day to alert Ms. Sieburth that a copy of the PCT claims was also filed in the supplemental response. To avoid the printing errors, the examiner will indicate that these "claims" filed 2/13/07 should NOT be entered. Also the examiner will try to have them expunged from the file.